

	PROJECT NAME: Cedar Creek Range East	
Row #	Commentor	Affected Resource
17	Chris Vogt	All
18	3-9-2012 Telephone comment	
19	Earl O'Rourke	Grazing
20	Earl O'Rourke	Fire
21	3-15-2012 Letter	
22	Michelle Wadley	General
22	3-15-2012 Telephone comment	
24	Gladys Ward	Grazing
25	3-19-2012 Letter	
26	Korey Wolfe - - Antlers and More	General
27	3-26-2012 Telephone comment	
28	Richard Wylde	Grazing
29	3-26-2012 Letter	

Row #	Commentor	Affected Resource
30	Sara VanderFeltz - - State of Missouri	All
31	3-27-2012 e-mail comment	
32	Brian Schweiss	Grazing, NNIS
33	4-2-2012 Letter comment	
34	Carol Robertson	Grazing
35	4-3-2012 E-mail comment	
36	Carl Rentschler	Grazing
37	4-4-2012 Letter	
38		

Row #	Commentor	Affected Resource
39	Teresa, Terrie, Mark and Earl Culwell	Grazing
40	Teresa, Terrie, Mark and Earl Culwell	NNIS
41	4-12-2012 Letter comment	
42	Kathy Vogt	Grazing
43	4-27-2012 E-mail comment	
44	Tom Dawson	Grazing
45	4-30-2012 Letter	
46	Andy Bonder	Grazing
47	6-4-2012 Telephone call documentation	

Comments received during 30 day Comment Period (36 CFR 215.6 (a))								
Signature <u>/s/ Kimberly Bittle</u>								
Kimberly Bittle, District Ranger								
Date <u>09/07/2012</u> (Same as Decision Notice)								
COMMENTS/POTENTIAL ISSUES ARE CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO WHETHER THEY ARE:								
1) RESOLVED BY FOREST PLAN DIRECTION								
2) ADDRESSED THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF FOREST PLAN S&Gs and BMPs								
3) ADDRESSED THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT-SPECIFIC DESIGN CRITERIA								
4) ADDRESSED DURING PROCESS OR ANALYSES ROUTINELY CONDUCTED BY ID TEAM								
5) ADDRESSED THROUGH SPACIAL LOCATION OF ACTIVITIES DURING ALTERNATIVE DESIGN								
6) USED TO DRIVE OR PARTIALLY DRIVE AN ALTERNATIVE or ALREADY INCORPORATED IN ALTERNATIVE DESIGN								
7) BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT and/or DOESN'T MEET THE STATED PURPOSE AND NEED								
8) FOREST SERVICE POLICY								
Comment/Potential Issue	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
He had no concerns on the project but doesn't like all of the ATV traffic on the forest and the Deer stands that are left behind.							X	
I have no grazing on my property. I use it for hunting and fishing. Cattle have gotten on my property twice in the 20 years we have owned the land. No damage was ever done.	X			X				
When you have had burns on the pasture around to my north, it was contained and no damage to my land.	X							
Need a quick explanation about what the project entails. She had no specific comments to make.				X				
I am pleased that the National Forest plans to make more grazing available to farmers, which is much needed.				X				
Need a quick explanation about what the project entails as one of his clients owns land next to the property. He had no specific comments to make specific to the Cedar Creek Range East project.				X				
The Gov. owned land next to me is overgrazed, not mowed enough and is overgrown with weeds, tall clover staff and Russian olive trees in fence rows. It wasn't mowed last year and needs to be. I looks terrible and it's a fire hazard, too much tall weeds and grass that cows won't eat. It should be mowed as soon as cows are out to allow the grass to grow ahead of the weeds.						X		

COMMENTS/POTENTIAL ISSUES ARE CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO WHETHER THEY ARE:								
1) RESOLVED BY FOREST PLAN DIRECTION								
2) ADDRESSED THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF FOREST PLAN S&Gs and BMPs								
3) ADDRESSED THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT-SPECIFIC DESIGN CRITERIA								
4) ADDRESSED DURING PROCESS OR ANALYSES ROUTINELY CONDUCTED BY ID TEAM								
5) ADDRESSED THROUGH SPACIAL LOCATION OF ACTIVITIES DURING ALTERNATIVE DESIGN								
6) USED TO DRIVE OR PARTIALLY DRIVE AN ALTERNATIVE or ALREADY INCORPORATED IN ALTERNATIVE DESIGN								
7) BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT and/or DOESN'T MEET THE STATED PURPOSE AND NEED								
8) FOREST SERVICE POLICY								
Comment/Potential Issue	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
The Missouri Federal Assistance Clearinghouse, in cooperation with state and local agencies interested or possibly affected, has completed the review on the above project application. None of the agencies involved in the review had comments or recommendations to offer at this time. This concludes the Clearinghouse's review.				X				
Mowing is inadequate to control Sericea lespedeza. Mowing in the fall puts all fields in the same habitat type. Grazing contract should include woodland/Forest improvement practices.						X	X	
My husband and I have been members of the Cedar Creek Grazing Association for over 10 years. We strongly support the efforts of the Forest Service to utilize land within the Mark Twain National Forest for grazing. Not only is it beneficial to us as cattle owners, but the benefits to the ecosystems within the forest land are enormous. I see first-hand the effects of Sericea lespedeza, an invasive plant that covers large amounts of land in our allotted area. I strongly urge the Forest Service to consider the use of herbicides as an additional method of control for Sericea and to include this as part of the management plan.				X		X		
I am a member of the Cedar Creek grazing Association. We count on these allotments as a good part of our overall grazing for our cattle herd, and hope that we will be able to graze these pastures in the future. We look at grazing on this land a priveledge and hope that it will be allowed in the future.				X		X		
End of timely Responses								

COMMENTS/POTENTIAL ISSUES ARE CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO WHETHER THEY ARE:								
1) RESOLVED BY FOREST PLAN DIRECTION								
2) ADDRESSED THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF FOREST PLAN S&Gs and BMPs								
3) ADDRESSED THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT-SPECIFIC DESIGN CRITERIA								
4) ADDRESSED DURING PROCESS OR ANALYSES ROUTINELY CONDUCTED BY ID TEAM								
5) ADDRESSED THROUGH SPACIAL LOCATION OF ACTIVITIES DURING ALTERNATIVE DESIGN								
6) USED TO DRIVE OR PARTIALLY DRIVE AN ALTERNATIVE or ALREADY INCORPORATED IN ALTERNATIVE DESIGN								
7) BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT and/or DOESN'T MEET THE STATED PURPOSE AND NEED								
8) FOREST SERVICE POLICY								
Comment/Potential Issue	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
We are members of the Cedar Creek grazing Association and have utilized several of these allotments. In the many years we have been affiliated, many positive changes and improvements have been made thru the partnership of the FS and CCGA. Grazing should be occasionally allowed in riparian areas or they will never improve. The occasional disturbance is necessary to turn up old seeds from the past and to bury seed for the future.						X		
We have seen a resurgence of different plants in this allotment and every effort should be made to keep these areas from becoming wastelands of sericea, multiflora rose and cedar trees.			X			X		
We are members of the Cedar Creek grazing Association with a forest pasture that we rent to keep our herd (11 cow/calf pairs and a bull) for 6 months of the year. I feel the program is a good one. It allows us access to additional pasture we could not afford.				X		X		
I believe for future you should forget cows. Take the money build impoundments (lake) make more like a wildness area for recreation and growing of different trees and grass to attract wildlife. Nothing likes fescue.				X			X	
He had no concerns just wanted a question answered to make sure nothing was changing to the current grazing.				X				

